	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/576,628	PETZELT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ERNST V. ARNOLD	1616	

All Participants:

(1) *ERNST V. ARNOLD*.

(2) *Joseph Coppola*.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *10 March 2010*   **Time:** _____

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☐ No
   If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Ernst V Arnold/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1616

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner noted that the cited art teach inhalation of xenon for sedation while Applicant disclosed introduction directly into the intestine or indirectly via the stomach in the protection of endothelial cells of the instestine in sepsis (pages 6-7 of the specification). The Examiner suggested to Applicant's representative that such an amendment would not be obvious over the cited references and put the case in condition for allowance. After consultation with the inventors, Applicant's representative informed the Examiner on 3/16/10 that such a limitation was not acceptable.